DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 206 614 SP 018 866

AUTHOR Gray, James B., Jr.; Rau, Dorothea M.
TITLE The ASU Project. Training for Cooperative Supervision. Management Analysis Paper.
PUB DATE [80]
NOTE 7p.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Departments; *Educational Cooperation; Field Experience Programs; Higher Education; Mainstreaming; Preservice Teacher Education; *Schools of Education; *Special Education Teachers; *Student Teacher Supervisors; Teacher Educator Education; *Teacher Educators
IDENTIFIERS Appalachian State University NC

ABSTRACT

With the increasing enrollment in preservice special education programs, a problem for many schools of education has been the redistribution of tenured, experienced faculty members to provide training for special education field programs. At Appalachian State University (ASU), in North Carolina, cooperation between the Departments of Laboratory Experiences, Elementary and Secondary Education, and Special Education overcame initial faculty resistance and led to a plan for paired supervision by generalists and special education specialists. Although some difficulties resulted from differences in faculty attitudes about supervision and an unwillingness to work with other departments, the first phase of the project was successful due to strategies that emphasized equal involvement of participants and practical training activities. Plans were formulated for ongoing development of training techniques, with followup workshops and videotapes of panel presentations. (PG)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED206614

Management Analysis Paper

The ASU Project

Training for Cooperative Supervision

by

James B. Gray, Jr.

and

Dorothea N. Rau

Presented by the Department of Special Education of Appalachian State University, in Boone, North Carolina, United States of America.

SP 018 866

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

- This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
- ☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Dorothea N. Rau

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

I. Background Information

1. Substantive Educational Issues

a. Large scale changes in US education

Events in American society in the past 25 years have mandated change in public education and consequently in the teacher training programs in all American universities and colleges. Since the famed court case "Brown vs. Board of Education" in 1954 education facilities for minority populations that are "separate but equal" have been declared unconstitutional. This court decision, prompted public education to dismantle any educational facility that segregated by race, creed, or color any group of individuals. It established the foundation for later decisions that defined the right of the handicapped to free access to all public facilities and all public opportunities.

b. Changes incurred in US special education

During the late sixties and early seventies class-action litigation such as the Pennsylvania Association for Retarded Children vs. Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, insured the development of suitable public services for the handicapped and provided the impetus for definitive governmental action. Public Law 94-142, the Education for all Handicapped Children Act of 1975, established for all handicapped persons the right to education, the utilization of least restrictive environments, the development and delivery of individualized educational programs, and the assurance of due process procedures.

c. Mainstreaming is yet an ideal to be achieved

A full implementation of the mandates of Public Law 94-142 needs yet to be achieved. After decades of segregated educational programming regular and special education teachers have to learn again the ground rules of working together. Team efforts are needed for proper integration of handicapped learners into the mainstream of local education programs. Cooperative planning action has to be exemplified at the teacher preparation level.

d. There is currently a trend of teacher oversupply

Another mater of concern has been the oversupply of teachers for regular elementary and secondary school positions. As the birthrate in the US dropped the number of school aged individuals decreased. For the first time in US history large numbers of teachers were unemployed and compelled to identify additional options which would allow them to teach. Those opportunities existed in the area of special education and were enhanced by federal monies that were being provided to universities to attract students who could be trained to be effective special educators. Subsequently enrollment increased in special education teacher training programs while it decreased in elementary and secondary teacher training programs.

e. Problems have also become acute in teacher training institutions

An equally important and equally drastic change occurred in faculty-student ratio. Large numbers of generally trained faculty who had supervised pre-service elementary and secondary teachers no longer had adequate numbers of students to supervise. In comparison special education faculty were faced with large numbers of students and increasing enrollments. The problem for many universities thus became, how to redistribute tenured experienced faculty or their faculty responsibility and insure that adequate experience and training was provided when they were asked to assume new and different responsibilities.

2. The ASU project

After prolonged discussions with often times hostile overtones an agreement was finally reached to commence with a design for cooperative training. The project in its first phase consisted of five two-hour panel presentations conducted during September - November, 1980 and videotaped for the purpose of evaluation and future replications.

3. The decision making process

Had it not been for the persistence of the acting chairman of the Department of Special Education to pursue his proposal of cooperative faculty training (as first suggested in 1978) the project would not have been initiated. Support was finally procured from the chairmen of the Departments of Laboratory Experiences, Elementary and Secondary Education, Educational Media, as well as from the Dean of the College and from the Vice Chancellor of the University. Extensive time was taken to interview personally, generalist supervisors who were initially resistant to the plan. A special invitation to them, to have an active part as panel presentors on topics of their choice contributed significantly to their willingness to cooperate.

4. The present state of the project

The project as it goes into a second phase will consist of paired supervision. Generalists and special education supervisors will go together to local school programs for handicapped learners and mutually observe and develop suitable supervisory procedures for special education student teachers within the given setting.

5. Funding

Funds for conducting the panel presentations inclusive of videotaping expenses and follow up training have been procured through the university.

6. Project evaluation

Ongoing systematic evaluation of the project has been designed and implemented by the staff of the Department of Laboratory Experiences.

II. Change Analysis

1. Hindering factors and strategies employed to overcome them

When the project began the following factors represented a hindering influence on the success of the innovation.

a. Traditional attitudes about supervision

___supervision should be totally personal and humanistic
___supervision is best left to the classroom teacher with visits from college supervisors utilized as an information sharing activity

b. Unwillingness to accept information from another department

___supervisors insisting on their autonomy
___resentment of the department of special education because of previous negative experiences
___fear of overly technical evaluation procedures

c. Strategies used to overcome hindering factors

___involvement of all faculty who could be affected by the change and providing them the opportunity to choose not to be involved
___establishment of meeting procedures that encouraged honest confrontation and insured democratic decision making
___planned activities that were to be carried out over a long period of time, in this case two years
___ample opportunity for participants to express concerns and frustration to the group, each other, and administrative heads
___establishment of procedures that were supportive to all affected college departments
___administrative attitudes that left no question about the certainity of the change but that were directed toward reinforcing any cooperative group or individual attempt
___a series of high quality goal specific training sessions that involved presentors from a variety of college departments and that encouraged group discussion
___a series of practical training activities that fostered the development of a cooperative attitude and the generation of a collegium of faculty that are dedicated to quality supervision across departments and disciplines

2. Unanticipated complications

During the early part of the program strong feelings of territoriality were expressed by one supervisor who refused to be a part of eventual paired supervision. Phase one of the program has been completed with higher

than expected participation.

3. Current status of the project

For the new phase of paired supervision each individual generalist supervisor will have to be helped to see himself in a full status position and not subordinated to staff of the Special Education Department.

III. Strategy Design

1. Project development

The project is designed for ongoing development with epochal emphasis on selected cooperation procedures.

2. Project replication

The project will be available for replication, needed revision and further expansion, by means of videotapes, scripts and resource materials which have been developed during the panel presentation.

3. Project dissemination

Increasing interaction between generalist and special education supervisors as well as local school representatives is anticipated in connection with paired supervisory assignments.

4. Project follow-up

Follow-up workshops in the summer would be provided for cooperating teachers in the field. Their input and participation would help to focus on needed revision in training for cooperative supervision.

5. Further project expansion

Mainstreaming in a more comprehensive form might be further achieved in a situation of paired supervision where special educators are guided to assignments with regular class pupils.